

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I asked to speak because the whip yielded back his time.

I understand the gentleman's contention. Very frankly, we did our business in a timely fashion and got a lot done these last 2 weeks, in our opinion. We may differ on that. We got, we think, a lot done in a bipartisan fashion, really, in terms of the votes.

I will tell you, the Foreign Affairs Committee had a hearing today; it is going on now. Lee Hamilton is testifying on Iraq. We believe that is timely and important. So that committee is meeting. I just got the notice of what committees are meeting.

I only state that because I believe my friend is correct, that early on we don't have as many committee meetings. We believe that having the time available for our committees to get work done is going to facilitate having meaningful work on the floor, and we hope that we can do our meaningful work on the floor in hours where it will provide for Members not having to work until 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock at night, even though it may save them 2 or 3 hours on a Friday. But we are going to work with you. We have worked together; we are going to continue to work together. We will have differences.

I am going to work with Mr. BOEHNER, the leader, to accommodate our Members. You are my friend. The fact that we are in session or not in session is not an indication of whether Members are working. That representation was never made, nor was it ever intended to be made. It is a misrepresentation, certainly in my view, that that is any contention of mine or implication that ought to be drawn. I think the gentleman agrees with that. Members work hard whether we are in session or not in session.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 38

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 23, 2007, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSION BILL REGARDING CONVICTED FORMER MEMBERS FALLS SHORT

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman Ney was sentenced to 30 months in jail after pleading guilty to two Federal felonies. Amazingly, under our law he will still collect a congressional pension funded by the U.S. taxpayer. In fact, other Members of Congress who pled guilty or were convicted of crimes collect. Congressman Rostenkowski collects. Congressman Traficant collects. Congressman Cunningham collects. All taxpayer-funded pensions.

On Monday, we will take up a very limited bill to kill pensions for Members of Congress who commit only one of four felonies. The legislation we will consider misses 17 other public integrity felonies that the House already adopted with the support of Speaker PELOSI and Speaker HASTERT in previous years. The legislation we consider on Monday has never been through a committee and the leadership will not allow any amendments to the legislation. There will be no vote permitted to add the other 17 public integrity felonies that should have been part of this needed reform. The legislation that we will consider on Monday will fall short of the potential that we had to reform this House.

□ 1200

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHANDLER). The Chair will now recognize Members for special orders not beyond 2 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO NEW TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is not so much on our agenda in these first 100 hours, but I believe it will encompass much of our focus during the course of the 110th Congress. It has to do with the how and why that we will achieve fundamental entitlement reform.

President Bush and many leaders in the new majority in the House and Senate have spoken of the priority of reforming Social Security and dealing with the extraordinary unfunded obligations of our mandates in future years. The President, to his credit, 2 years ago raised the prospect of fundamental Social Security reform. But the American people rejected the President's call.

And I rise today to speak about what I believe the parameters of that debate should be from the perspective of a conservative in the minority who believes in the principles of limited government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people did not reject the Social Security reform or the personal retirement accounts that the President advanced. I think they rejected the entire debate and how it unfolded. I think they rejected the notion that the predominant goal of Social Security reform was to make the numbers add up or, in the language of the wonks, to achieve solvency in Social Security. Such a yardstick expresses no opinion on how to fix an increasingly bankrupt system, and I believe that as a result it invariably blesses benefit cuts or tax increases as a result.

And while President Bush has spoken to his opposition to tax increases, Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson has repeatedly said, in conversations with Members of the House and Senate, that "everything is on the table," raising the specter of the possibility of raising taxes to achieve Social Security reform. And even the President's own Press Secretary, when asked directly whether the White House was ruling out a tax increase to achieve Social Security reform with this newly minted